

REPORT ON NEUTRALITY BY THE NATIONAL AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

The following unanimous report of the national affairs committee was duly adopted by the National Republican Club at its regular monthly meeting on September 26, 1939:

"It is imperative that our country should keep out of war. We must remain at peace not only to save the lives of American youth but also to make sure that we retain the American form of government and way of life. It would not profit America to enter upon a second European crusade only to find here at the journey's end a regimented nation permanently deprived of its historic freedoms. This view has the support of an overwhelming majority of our people. The important problem is to determine the procedure we ought to follow in order to attain our objective.

"The troubled situation in Europe naturally has made the question of any change in our neutrality laws a subject of grave and earnest inquiry. Differences of view exist and are wide, but we should be slow to attribute to any person, no matter how much his views may differ from our own, any but the highest motives. And it ought not to be necessary to add that the treatment of this serious question should be entirely devoid of partisan politics.

"PEACE AND SECURITY

"In drafting neutrality legislation the maintenance and protection of the peace and security of our own people, so far as attainable without injury to our vital interests, must always be the primary objective. Our neutrality statutes, as they existed prior to the act of 1935, were in accordance with this principle. Those statutes recognized that our intercourse with foreign nations has always been conducted by our executive department and left that department free to meet and consult with the executives of other nations on a footing of equality, and to propose to Congress as any emergency arises such further legislation as the realities of the actual situation may require. Those laws imposed nothing on other nations which we would not have been willing that other nations impose upon us.

"No legislation can be passed, and none ought to be attempted, which will bring about complete equality of opportunity to the warring nations. As a nation at peace with all the contending parties, we ought not to pass legislation that accentuates, minimizes, or offsets advantages.

"PRESENT EMBARGO UNNEUTRAL

"Tested by the foregoing principles, we think that the automatic embargo on shipments to belligerents of arms, ammunition, and implements of war, including airplanes, is unneutral. It is also deceptive. It permits Germany, through Russia and possibly other countries, and perhaps France and England, through Italy and possibly other countries, to obtain at least the benefit of our munitions without the actual transshipment forbidden by the statute. Furthermore, the embargo does not apply to our larger shipments to belligerents of steel, cotton, copper, oil, and many other products indispensable for war purposes. And it has been estimated that these war materials constitute 90 percent of our trade with France and England, as contrasted with a 10-percent trade in munitions of war with those countries. We urge that the automatic-embargo provision be quickly repealed. If this is done, we shall be operating under the principles of international law, with which America and all other countries are largely familiar. These principles are neither perfect nor perfectly understood, but they are the result of the applied experience of centuries of international dealings.

"PRECAUTIONS

"However, to lessen our contacts with the belligerents on the high seas, thus minimizing incidents involving loss of American cargoes, ships, and lives, we favor a 'cash and carry' provision affecting not only munitions but all other materials. If it be urged that Germany is not now in a position to pay and carry away, we answer that there is no reason why a neutral should seek to deprive France and England of the benefits resulting from their sea power and greater financial resources.

"We believe that the provisions of the 1935 Neutrality Act, as amended in 1937, placing restrictions on travel and on loans, and setting up the Munitions Control Board, should be maintained substantially as they now exist.

"PREPAREDNESS ESSENTIAL

"Finally, notwithstanding all our peaceful intentions, we believe that our chief guaranties against being drawn into the European war are preparedness and a clear and steadfast assertion of our rights as a nation. At the time of the World War many foreign military men regarded us as both unwilling and unable to fight for any cause. That was a chief reason for our being drawn into war. Now we have highly resolved to keep our giant strength under restraint and not to become involved in war because of isolated incidents affecting our trade, property, or citizens. But that is not enough. In addition we must let all other nations know by unmistakable declaration and conduct that we will never submit to deliberate and repeated aggression against America itself, nor to clear and persistent violation of the Monroe Doctrine in any other part of the Western Hemisphere.

"It is our considered judgment that repeal of the embargo, adoption of a 'cash and carry' provision, adequate preparedness to repel foreign aggression in this hemisphere, supplemented by a calm and dignified, yet steadfast, insistence upon all of our vital rights, will lead us, even in this world aflame, along the true path of peace.

"NATIONAL AFFAIRS COMMITTEE,
"JOHN EDMOND HEWITT, Chairman.
"WILLIAM S. BENNET,
"Subcommittee Chairman.

"SEPTEMBER 26, 1939."

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock a. m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 28 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, October 25, 1939, at 11 o'clock a. m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 24, 1939

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Donald Haven, Order of Friars Minor, Shantung, China, offered the following prayer:

O God, our refuge and our strength, look down with favor upon Thy children crying to Thee. Grant that we may walk in Thy presence, O loving Father, and stand before Thy countenance. Assembled here before Thee, we look to Thee for guidance and assistance; lead us, help us.

Enlighten our minds, O Father of lights, to know the truth and follow it. Grant us an understanding heart to discern between good and evil.

May the power of Thy Holy Spirit be with us, O Lord, that what Thou dost command us to do, we may by Thy mercy accomplish. Thus may every enactment of this law-making body be in all things conformed to the law of God.

O ever-blessed Saviour, Prince of Peace, who for us men and for our salvation didst come down from Heaven, grant peace in our days.

May our every effort be directed toward peace with justice and charity. Peace, peace, O Jesus! Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. GIBSON members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of February 16, 1889, as amended by the act of March 2, 1895, entitled "An act to authorize and provide for the disposition of useless papers in the executive departments," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agency:

1. Department of the Navy.
2. Department of the Treasury.
3. Work Projects Administration.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks and to include therein an article from the Canadian Business magazine of October dealing with our neutrality issue on the subject, Hands Off the United States.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, 72 years ago this week the United States acquired the Territory of Alaska, and I think it is only fitting and proper that I ask at this time unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a short article respecting this acquisition, written by a prominent Seattle newspaperman.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE EXTRA SESSION OF CONGRESS

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, a great deal of publicity has been given during the last few days to the probability that the Senate and the House will dispose of the amendment to the Neutrality Act within 2 weeks and the Members of Congress may then go home.

While I realize, just as much as you do, that the Congress was called into special session for the purpose of considering amendments to the Neutrality Act—it just seems to me that we have made, and are making, a great mistake in not using the time during which we are here, in giving consideration to legislation that is now pending before Congress, and which must come up for consideration when Congress convenes the first of January.

Just think of it—we have been here for more than a month—435 Members of the House of Representatives, brought to Washington at the expense of the United States Government, and have not given consideration to a single measure except the appropriation bill for the expense of this session. This House could have used every bit of this time in consideration of bills now pending on the House Calendar, as well as that of holding committee hearings for the consideration of bills that have been introduced, together with appropriation measures and tax-revision bills which are bound to come up in the next session. One of the greatest questions we have before us right now is that of tax revision. The House could do well to spend its time in giving consideration to these important measures. Then we have the question of national defense—one of the most important problems at this time—and yet we have not turned a hand, through committee meetings or otherwise, to give this problem serious consideration.

Why is it not possible for the House to get control of itself and get down to business—to give consideration to measures that ought to be cared for and that are certain to come up in the next session? Why not, rather than consider the immediate probability of being sent home, spend the next 4 weeks or so in session, considering some of these most important measures now pending, together with other important problems that are bound to come up during the next session? It seems almost deplorable that the House of Representatives, consisting of 435 Members, shall go home and tell their constituents they have been here for 6 or 7 weeks and so far as consideration of measures was concerned, they were in session for not more than 4 or 5 days? Members of the House, it is not right. It is not fair to the Members of Congress. And above all things, it is just not fair to the people who sent us here.

We have lost 5 weeks of valuable and expensive time but can still begin, right here and now, and make good use of the weeks between now and January 1. After all, it is what the Members of Congress are paid for. It is what is expected of them, and it certainly is the thing we ought to do. We have no right to go home and quit the job when there are so many things left undone. Tell me again, who is running this Congress, anyhow?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may insert in the RECORD as part of my own remarks a letter on the subject of neutrality by one of America's greatest citizens, Dr. A. Lawrence Lowell.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

ONE WAY TO RAISE MONEY TO PAY GOVERNMENT EXPENSES

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, the Democratic platform of 1932 contained this statement:

We condemn the improper and excessive use of money in political activities.

Let me call your attention to the fact that 1,257 Democrats in Philadelphia paid \$100 a plate to raise funds for the party. For only \$100 a plate, 1,257 Philadelphia Democrats last night dined on—

Grapefruit, celery and olives, consomme, filet of sole, filet mignon (with mushrooms), potatoes au gratin, and peas, biscuits, ice cream, coffee, and mints.

They also got music, a floor show, and several political speeches. The dinner actually cost \$4,399.50. And that left \$121,300.50 "gravy" for expenses of the last 13 days of the mayoralty campaign.

It seems to me that the use of \$100 dinners to coerce men in political office should be over. Is there a dinner that is worth \$100? Is there an officeholder in Philadelphia who can afford to pay \$100 for a dinner? Certainly not. It is only political graft and corruption that would compel 1,257 people in Philadelphia to attend a dinner costing \$100 per plate. Such high-pressure politics has no place in American public life, whether it be Philadelphia, Washington, or any other place in this Nation.

This is one way the Democrats have of getting money to uphold political prestige. It might be well to try to raise money in this manner, if possible, to pay off our Government debt and conserve America's resources as well as trying to balance our Budget. Unless these things are done, we shall wreck our Government. Certainly we shall wreck it if we continue as we are now progressing in the expenditure of Government funds.

We are at this time, the first quarter of the fiscal year, \$1,250,000,000 in the red on current operating expenses. It seems to me something should be done to stop this ruthless expenditure of Government funds, spent in every conceivable way, contrary to our Constitution and against the wishes of the taxpayers of America. [Applause.]

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks to include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, on innumerable occasions you, as well as all the Members of the House, have heard the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] decry the practice of Members inserting in the RECORD a lot of extraneous matter. He has sought to place the blame for that on the leadership on the majority side of the House. As late as last October 5 he again complained of the practice of the Members inserting extraneous matter in the RECORD, and asserted that—

The people of this country would not recognize it as a record of the transactions that have transpired in the Congress. It is simply a record of newspaper articles, of editorials, or everything in the country. Every Tom, Dick, and Harry has a right to say something in the RECORD.

Now, I agree in principle with the attitude of the gentleman from Pennsylvania on the subject, and you will fail to find that I have, on any occasion, inserted a newspaper article or editorial. I regret to say, however, that the gentleman from Pennsylvania is not consistent to the same degree. Just a few days ago, on October 20, he obtained unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an article which appears on page 656. This article is, to put it mildly, extraneous from every standpoint. I cannot see how it could have any appeal to the people of the country at large who generally read the RECORD. It is very peculiar that the gentleman from Pennsylvania failed to inform the readers the authorship of the article, or to whom the credit or discredit for the same should be given. It is entirely political and, as is so often the case with political literature, is misleading in the extreme. It is entitled "The Millions Already Saved by the James Administration in Pennsylvania."

What reason the gentleman from Pennsylvania had in not disclosing the authorship of the article which he chose to insert in the RECORD at the expense of the taxpayers I do not know, but I think I am safe in assuming that it is from the pen of one of the Pennsylvania Governor's advertising experts.

Of this advertising campaign, an independent and non-partisan western Pennsylvania newspaper, the Pittsburgh Press, in its issue of Sunday, October 22, 1939, editorially had this to say, among other things:

JAMES RUNS FOR PRESIDENT AT PUBLIC EXPENSE

The advertisements which the James administration is running in national periodicals at a cost of nearly \$11,000 per month to the taxpayers border on outright dishonesty.

Not only do they contain half truths and untruths, but the nature of them is obviously political—intended to boost the national reputation of Gov. Arthur H. James.

If you do not believe this, we ask you to turn to page 87 of the current Saturday Evening Post and see for yourself and then to send for the booklet described in the advertisement and also to examine it.

This administration, which has so bitterly attacked the honesty of the previous Democratic regime, is using taxpayers' money in a method which we charge is immoral and unfair. * * *

Four hundred thousand dollars was taken from the State motor funds—formerly used exclusively to build and maintain highways—to finance the new department which has been turned into a James publicity bureau.

The claims contained in the current advertisement are amazing. Among them is a contention that State pay rolls have been cut 17 percent and administrative expense has been cut 20 percent.

There's just one answer to such extravagant claims: If true, then why did the James administration reenact every one of the \$163,000,000 of emergency taxation imposed by the Earle administration, and which the Governor attacked during his campaign as driving business from the State? Why, if true, is Pennsylvania now faced with a special legislative session to raise through new taxation an additional \$150,000,000 in relief funds not provided for at the regular session?

Such things as this, we contend, are false and misleading, and the expenditure of State funds to boost the personal stock of the Governor is a gross misuse of public money.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania, in his excessive zeal to speak for economy on any and every occasion, has unwittingly lent his aid by having published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD some of the political publicity blurbs of the James administration, which the Pittsburgh Press editorially charges is immoral and unfair and a gross misuse of public money.

Perhaps the gentleman from Pennsylvania has enlisted himself in the personal laudation campaign of the Governor for the purpose of attracting the attention of the people of the country to his aspirations to be the Republican candidate for President; but, knowing the gentleman as I do, I am positive that he would not, knowingly, have inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, for any purpose whatsoever, matter which is misleading to say the least, aside from being purely political and extraneous.

I do hope, however, that the gentleman from Pennsylvania will, in the future, refrain from endeavoring to place the responsibility for the appearance of extraneous matter in the RECORD upon the shoulders of the majority leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to insert excerpts from the editorial referred to.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, in reference to the statement of the gentleman about the majority party trying to conserve the RECORD, may I say that no effort has been made by the majority party in any sense, in any manner, or in any form, to try to keep extraneous matter out of the RECORD. What is the use of anyone trying to make up a record of Congress, because it is not such record now and it never has been since the present administration has been in power.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I secured unanimous consent for an extension in the RECORD, but I am advised by the Public Printer it is slightly in excess of the permissible amount. I have received an estimate from the printer and renew my request, notwithstanding the estimate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the Chicago Tribune.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article from the Pulp and Paper Mill News on the question of importation of foreign pulp.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. GEYER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Speaker, from time to time the older Members of the House have risen and given to us younger Members advice which has been very valuable. I wish to give at this time a little advice to my colleagues who are just as new to the House as myself. There has been written a book which I believe is very, very worth while dealing with the "third House" or the lobby practices. This book mentions names and places. I recommend to the younger Members that they read this book. To the older Members, may I say, if I were some of you, I would read this book, and if the things are not true that are stated therein, I would do something about it. The name of the book is *The Pressure Boys*, by Kenneth G. Crawford, of the New York Post and the Philadelphia Record. You may get it through the stationery room. The price of the book is \$3 without the discount.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, my colleague from Texas, Mr. PATMAN, is necessarily absent. Permission has heretofore been granted him to extend his remarks on the report of the Federal Trade Commission in recent motor-car industry inquiry. An estimate has been obtained from the printer, which I submit, and I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas may insert this in the RECORD notwithstanding the estimate of the Public Printer.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial from the Henry County Signal, Napoleon, Ohio, relative to the farm situation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLEVINGER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. VREELAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a speech made by myself on Wednesday night at the fathers' dinner of the Junior Cavalry of America.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. VREELAND]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am sure we are all glad to have the advice of the gentleman from California about the book to which he referred. Was it Corcoran and Cohen who wrote the book?

Mr. GEYER of California. Since the gentleman asked me, it was written by Kenneth Crawford, whose veracity cannot be questioned.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I am somewhat familiar with the book to which the gentleman has referred. I have read, with more than usual interest, the second chapter entitled, "A Congressman Must Derive Income." In connection with that chapter I note that while some Members of the Senate and

the House are pilloried, the author deals very tenderly with those who lobby for the New Deal.

On page 35 he writes, "The lobbyists of the left throughout the Roosevelt administration have been able, sincere, and idealistic, but for all that, amateurs." The author undoubtedly is familiar with the activities of Postmaster General, National Democratic Chairman, Jim Farley, and the sale of the autographed national committee convention books, yet a hasty examination of the book fails to disclose any criticism of "Big Jim."

At the last postmaster's convention, held here in Washington, not only were the postmasters royally entertained, but we find that, in return, the postmasters were not unappreciative of their chief's consideration for their welfare. A committee of which Philip L. Fellingner, postmaster of East Orange, N. J., was chairman, put out a mimeographed letter requesting the postmasters to take advantage of a special convention price of \$2 for a copy of Mr. Farley's autographed biography. The book, to which the gentleman from California made reference, is well worth reading, but it should be kept in mind that it contains little, if any, real criticism of the manner in which the Roosevelts have used their official positions to gather in the shekels.

Mr. Speaker, there is another book which might be read with profit by those interested in violations of civil liberties, in maintaining a constitutional form of government, though I would not be so presumptuous as to suggest what any Member of the House should read. However, if information is sought, some that is of value can be obtained from reading this little book of 93 pages, entitled, "The Red Network." It gives a brief outline of the Communist International at work. It was published this year by Duckworth, 3 Henrietta Street, London, W. C. 2.

A list of publications issued by bodies associated with the Communist Party is given as follows: Daily Worker, daily; Challenge, weekly; Labour Monthly, monthly; Labour Research, monthly; Discussion, monthly; New Builders' Leader, monthly; Finsbury Clarion, monthly; Holborn Outlook, monthly; Party Organizer, monthly; The Printer, monthly; Our Youth, monthly; Russia Today, monthly; Left News, monthly; Conveyor, monthly; New Propeller, monthly; Irish Front, monthly; Teachers' International Review, monthly; The Country Standard, monthly; World News and Views, weekly, formerly known as International Press Correspondence.

This book points out, among other things, that the Communist Party is the real governing agency of Russia; that the government of the Soviet Union is controlled by the Communist Party which, through a central executive committee, issues its orders which are carried out by a Council of People's Commissars. It further appears from this little work that the Communist Party here in America is but a branch of the Russian Communist organization, and it follows that we here in America are permitting on our ballots the name of a party, and the names of party candidates for elective offices in State and Nation, when that party and those candidates are financed by, owe allegiance to, and work in the interest of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, which in turn is the creature of the Communist Party.

You read in your papers last night and this morning that Browder, a recent Communist candidate for President of the United States of America, and who now has endorsed Roosevelt for a third term, was arrested, charged with traveling on a forged passport to his headquarters in Soviet Russia.

Just how long will we permit to exist this organization which preaches the doctrines, which practices methods designated to overthrow our Government by force? How much longer must we wait for the law enforcing agency of our Federal Government to rid us of this red group by either deporting them or throwing them into jail for violation of the criminal law? How much longer will we permit this organization, its candidates, and its members to hide behind the La Follette's Senate Civil Liberties Committee, the National Labor Relations Board, the administration itself?

Mr. GEYER of California. I would like to say that there is a chapter in this book on Tom Girdler. I would like to have the gentleman read it. I think it would be very enlightening.

Mr. HOFFMAN. If there was anything true about him published in a book, such as the gentleman suggests, I will be glad to read it, and I would suggest that the gentleman read something about Harry Bridges and where he gets his money, and something of his anti-American activities.

Mr. GEYER of California. You read this one and we will both be happy.

Mr. HOFFMAN. If the gentleman understands this one.

Mr. GEYER of California. And it would be hard for you probably, too.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ALLEN] has heretofore been granted by unanimous consent 30 minutes to address the House. He has been unavoidably detained. I ask that this order be vacated and that his time be put over until another date, for which he will request unanimous consent.

The SPEAKER. Under a special order of the House heretofore entered, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HENDRICKS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

WORLD CONDITIONS AND NEUTRALITY

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that there can be any such thing as absolute neutrality in regard to the war which is now going on in Europe for two reasons: First, because of the nature of this war; and secondly, because of our own interests.

Recently I heard a Member of the House declare, "What we want in Europe is peace, and I am not concerned with the terms."

I. NEUTRALITY

I do not believe the gentleman meant exactly what he said, or if he did, that he was expressing the feelings of the American people, for "I am not concerned" would mean that we were not only neutral as far as the law goes but also neutral in our sympathies, and I do not believe this to be true.

No matter what we say to the contrary, there are many things concerning which we cannot be neutral. For example, I cannot be neutral against sin, against corruption, against murder, against crime in any form. Consequently I cannot be neutral against crime, even though the crime is being committed across the Atlantic, thousands of miles away; I cannot be neutral to the murder of thousands of persons by the order of the head of another nation merely because they happen to be of another race or another religious creed; I cannot be neutral to the wanton seizure of a weak nation by a strong one; I cannot be neutral to the expressed desires of the head of a European state to conquer and rule the entire world, including North and South America.

We in America, thanks to the splendid activities of J. Edgar Hoover, have rid ourselves of the gangsters and hoodlums that formerly preyed upon our people. But even the American gangster considered certain things sacred.

Let me bring your memories back to a hot afternoon late in July of 1931. A group of children were playing on East One Hundred and Seventh Street, in the city of New York. Suddenly a large sedan swung around the corner, its machine gun blazing, and a 5-year-old child fell to the pavement, mortally wounded. Did the hardened gangsters laugh this away? On the contrary, even these men with no morals at all made an outcast of the gangster, Vincent Coll, who was reputed to have caused the killing of this child. He was called "baby killer," and the underworld itself swore he would be liquidated for this act. Several months later he was shot to death in a telephone booth by his gangster friends. Even the underworld which made light of the murder of men shuddered at the murder of defenseless and innocent children.

For several years gangster governments in Europe and Asia have been slaughtering innocent women and children, and yet we say we live in a civilized world.

At dawn on September 1 not a big sedan but a German juggernaut, with all its destructive fury, crossed the Polish bor-

der, swung down the Corridor and into Warsaw, supported in the sky by death-dealing machines, and there was not just a single 5-year-old child killed, but a homeland was laid waste, another flag of democracy trampled in the earth, and hundreds of women and children lay cold in death, covered in a mat of their own blood. If we cannot be neutral to the slaying of one child, how can we be neutral toward the machine gunning of hundreds of defenseless women and children simply because that act is committed by the dictator of a great nation? And if gangsterism is allowed to flourish in Europe, how long will it be before bullets are spraying the streets of America? We cannot be neutral in our sympathies to such things.

II. OUR OWN INTERESTS

Now, in regard to the interests and the security of our people, and the institutions which we hold sacred, I am aware that I am no military expert, but not yet have I been convinced that it is inconceivable that the totalitarian states of Europe have designs on the Western Hemisphere, nor am I alone in that belief, as you are well aware. I can give many citations from prominent Americans on this point, which I am not inserting in the Record at this time, but there are two books on sale today, and they are among the best sellers, which every American should read. One of these books is *The Revolution of Nihilism*, by Herman Rauschnig, a German, educated at Pottsdam, Munich, and Berlin universities, a man who at one time was high in the councils of the Nazi regime and president of the Danzig Senate in 1933 and 1934. You may question Mr. Rauschnig as an authority. That makes no difference to me, because if you will read his book you will find out that he predicted far in advance many things that Hitler was going to do. You will discover that he predicted the Russian-German alliance. The other book is *No Compromise*, written by Melvin Rader, professor of philosophy at the University of Washington. I wish to quote each of these men, and you may accept them for what they are worth as to the designs of foreign powers on this hemisphere, and also as to the dangers of foreign ideologies.

Rauschnig:

The Nazi leaders in "geopolitics" state that England is a decadent nation, no longer fit to rule; that France is dead; and that only Nazi Germany, which has both the capacity and the will to rule, will eventually rule the entire world.

I quote him again:

In the National Socialist view the political situation in America is unstable and can be developed into an outright revolution; to do this is both a tactical aim of national socialism, in order to hold America aloof from Europe, and a political one in order to bring both North and South America into the new order. By its ubiquity and its tactics of universal menace national socialism is preparing to occupy the key positions for colonial domination, for domination of the great sea routes, and for the domination of America and the Pacific.

The author writes of attempts of various leaders to point Germany toward an alliance with Russia. The army was for this, as it would cover Germany's rear. I quote Rauschnig briefly again:

A German-Russian alliance means simply the confluence of two streams which run toward the same sea—the sea of world revolution. . . . It will be no ordinary coalition between two powers for normal practical purposes. Germany and Russia, if they come together, will radically transform the world. That alliance is Hitler's great coming stroke.

I quote from Mr. Rader just briefly on the same point:

Even in "isolated" America we must not lull ourselves into a false sense of security. It is obvious that the antidemocratic offensive is world-wide, and that it threatens free institutions wherever they exist.

We must not delude ourselves into supposing that we live in a social vacuum. If peace or democracy is destroyed in the rest of the world, we cannot escape without catastrophe.

Suppose, for instance, that the totalitarian states should bring the Allies to their knees, and should dictate the terms of peace, as the Allies did with the Central Powers in 1918. We will generally concede that France and England are more disposed toward humane principles than the governments of totalitarian states of today, yet we know now of the terms of the 1918 peace, which were, without a doubt, to crush, or at

least greatly suppress, the German people. Then, is there any reason not to believe that should the totalitarian states win and Europe and the east come under the domination of Germany, Russia, Italy, and Japan, that their demands would probably be the surrender, or at least the sinking, of the navies of the Allies, and the cession of all the most important colonial possessions?

Is it inconceivable that with the combined forces of these states after the lapse of a few years, in which time they could consolidate their rich gains, that they should make heavy demands upon this hemisphere? You know that it has been only recently that the State Department has realized the tremendous effect of the German propaganda on the countries to the south of us, and the ideologies of even foreign nations can creep in where a people is already burdened by confiscatory taxes, which would be our condition should we find it necessary to defend ourselves against that which a majority of the citizens feel is impossible, but which many intelligent people feel is quite possible.

Oh, you say this is impossible in the first place. My reply is that empires have been destroyed because of a like assumption. You may say that when such an occasion arises we will enforce the Monroe Doctrine—and I agree with you that this could be done for quite a while, but at what cost? Our peacetime expenditures for national defense have already reached the billion-dollar mark. The nations of the world spent \$17,000,000,000 for national defense in 1938, and the expenditures this year will be far greater. Germany alone spent almost \$5,000,000,000 last year. We could enforce the Monroe Doctrine for a while at a staggering cost, and when this Nation became bankrupt and hungry, as foreign nations are today, then we liberty-loving Americans could really fear the old slogan, "Peace at any price"—and the price may be communism or some other "ism" that we do not want in America.

III. PEACE

What about peace at this time? Hitler and a number of the Senators have recently suggested and demanded that Mr. Roosevelt step in and be mediator at a peace conference. I wonder if Mr. Hitler would insist upon the President meeting him at Munich, changing his name to Chamberlain, and selling out the remainder of the democracies? What an appealing gesture in the light of the fact that the President made two appeals to Mr. Hitler to keep the peace, one of which received an insulting reply indirectly, and the other a cool air of indifference.

I hope the President has better sense than to participate in such a conference at this stage of the war, for if he should he would be more discredited within a year than Woodrow Wilson ever was. I say this in the light of the record. If peace were made at this time, Hitler would break it again within a year. Do not forget this man's ambitions of world conquest, and particularly his ambition as set forth in *Mein Kampf*. These objectives have not as yet been accomplished, and for this reason I ask you how long would he keep his promise? As an insight into his character let me again quote Rauschnig:

Hitler had told me that morning what was his view of the value of treaties. He was ready to guarantee any frontier and to conclude a nonaggression pact with anyone. It was a simpleton's idea not to avail one's self of expedients of this sort because the day might come when some formal agreement would have to be broken. Every pact sworn to was broken or became out of date sooner or later. Anyone who was so fussy that he had to consult his conscience about whether he could keep to a pact, whatever the pact and whatever the situation, was a fool. Why not please other people and ease one's own position by signing pacts, if the other people thought that got them anywhere or settled anything? He could conclude any treaty in good faith, and yet be ready to break it in cold blood the next day, if that was in the interest of the future of Germany.

Better yet, let me give you the record of this man's promises, made and broken. It simply proves to us that what Mr. Rauschnig said here is true and I am quoting Mr. Hitler:

HOW GOOD IS HITLER'S WORD?

August 1933:

As long as I am Chancellor there will be no war, save in the event of an invasion of our territory from without.

January 30, 1934, before the Reichstag:

The German Government is willing and determined to accept in its innermost soul, as well as external formulation, the pact of Locarno.

May 1935—interview with writer Edward Price Bell:

Mr. BELL. There are no territorial questions about which you would go to war?

HITLER. None. We have renounced solemnly all such purposes. * * * The Germany of national socialism will never dishonor itself and betray humanity by violating a pact it voluntarily signs.

On March 7, 1936, Hitler sent German troops into the Rhineland's neutralized zones and repudiated the Treaty of Locarno.

May 21, 1935, before the Reichstag:

Germany has neither the wish nor the intention to mix in internal Austrian affairs or annex Austria.

February 12, 1938, Hitler to Chancellor Schuschnigg, of Austria, at Berchtesgaden:

What is all this nonsense about your independence? Whether Austria is independent or not is not the question. There's only one thing to discuss: Do you want the Anschluss brought about with bloodshed or without? Take your choice.

March 7, 1936, before the Reichstag:

* Czechoslovakia, like Poland, always followed the policy of representing their own national interests. Germany does not desire to attack these states. * * * After 3 years I believe I can today regard the struggle for German equality as over. We have no territorial demands to make in Europe.

September 26, 1938, in Sports Palace at Berlin:

The Sudetenland is the last territorial demand I have to make in Europe.

September 1, 1939, war was declared on Poland. Now Mr. Hitler wants no more territory. He only wants time to take it.

Let us stay out of it. Russia and Germany have joined hands. Mussolini to all intents and purposes has remained neutral and has made some seemingly sincere attempts to bring about peace. Well, let us see. This is a statement made by Mussolini when he thought no one was listening:

The struggle between two worlds (democracy and fascism) can permit no compromise; either we or they.

Benevolent Benito.

War should be the only study of a prince. He should consider peace only as a breathing time, which gives him leisure to contrive and furnishes ability to execute military plans.

Machiavelli, the prince.

Hitler, Stalin, Mussolini—what are these Machiavellian princes up to? Are they asking for time to "give themselves leisure to contrive and furnish ability to execute military plans"? Will Hitler later take the Scandinavian countries and perhaps Holland and Belgium under his benevolent protection?

Remember that in Hitler's mind only the Germans have the will to rule and will rule the world. Will the vulture of communism swoop down upon the Balkans and Turkey and Mussolini finally get control of the Suez Canal and take Tunisia?

I do not know whether they will do these things or not, but they will if they can.

LIST OF CONQUESTS

Let me give you a list of aggressive campaigns by the totalitarian states since 1932:

Nineteen thirty-two, Manchuria by Japan; 1932, North China by Japan; 1935-36, Ethiopia by Italy; 1937 and 1939, China proper by Japan; March 13, 1938, Austria by Germany; 1939, Czechoslovakia by Germany; 1939, Memel by Germany; 1939, Albania by Italy; 1939, Poland by Germany, and, I might add, the Baltic States by Russia. Theoretically a conquest of 225,000,000 people. This is the record of aggression made by these totalitarian states.

No, Mr. President, have none of the peace conference now. Let us stand aside and preserve our powers and prestige, so if the Allies are brought to their knees we can step into the peace conference and prevent them from being dominated by totalitarian states, and so that if Germany is defeated we

can at least try to protect the world against another Versailles.

IV. THE BILL

Now, briefly, in regard to the present neutrality bill, I reserve the right to come to a final determination as to how I shall vote after I have heard the debate in the House. I find it is never too late to learn. But whatever form this bill is in when it finally passes, I do not think it will either put us in or keep us out of the war. I think that as to whether we shall enter the war, or whether we shall not, will depend upon how belligerents, in desperation, may prosecute the war at a later date, and what reaction shall come from the American people. We continually refer to ourselves as a peace-loving Nation. We are no such thing. We landed here fighting and, comparatively speaking, we have been fighting ever since. Here is a list of the wars and incidents in which we have participated:

Revolutionary War, 1775-83.

War of 1812, 1812-15.

War with Mexico, 1846-47.

Civil War (Union), 1861-65.

War with Spain, 1898.

World War I, 1917-18.

In spite of this list, I hope we learned something from the last war, and I assure you that however I vote on this bill, as far as my limited understanding is concerned, it shall be what I believe to be to the best interests of my country. To those of you who vote to the contrary to what I vote, I attribute the same pure intent.

Grant us grace fearlessly to contend against evil, and to make no peace with oppression; and that we may reverently use our freedom, help us to employ it in the maintenance of justice among men and nations.

[Applause.]

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENDRICKS. Yes; I will be glad to answer any questions.

Mr. GIFFORD. I want to ask the gentleman if it would be any real comfort to him, referring to the first part of his address, if he should read, as he probably has, that Hitler is now a prisoner of Stalin?

Mr. HENDRICKS. Yes; that would be a great deal of comfort and I wish Stalin was also a prisoner of Hitler.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENDRICKS. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. I was very much interested in the gentleman's opening thought and his statement that you could not be neutral toward crime and bloodshed generally in Europe or here. I concede your right as a citizen of Florida to take that position, but are you willing to vote as a representative of the United States Government to cause the Government to commit an unneutral act? In other words, how unneutral are you willing to be in order to wipe out those abuses and atrocities abroad?

Mr. HENDRICKS. The gentleman wants a frank answer, I suppose?

Mr. MILLER. Yes, certainly.

Mr. HENDRICKS. I am going to answer the gentleman just as I would answer my constituents in the State of Florida. I said you could not be absolutely neutral in your sympathies. I implied that in regard to the law you can be neutral, as far as the law goes.

Mr. MILLER. No. No. That is not my question. The question is how unneutral are you willing this Government to be?

Mr. HENDRICKS. Absolutely neutral, as far as the law is concerned. The point is this, if I may explain. Down in our hearts, if we say we are neutral we might be telling an untruth. We might say, "As far as this law is concerned I am going to vote for what I think is a neutral law," and to the letter of the law you may, but in your sympathies you are not neutral. I think I am speaking for at least 90 percent of the American citizens when I say that. I hope I have made that point clear.

Mr. MILLER. Yes; that is clear.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENDRICKS. I yield.

Mr. PATRICK. The gentleman will concede that we all wish to, as long as we can maintain a decent position, stay out of any trouble in the world.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Certainly, we do.

Mr. PATRICK. Certainly with the European conflagration as it now exists.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Yes.

Mr. PATRICK. Now, does not the gentleman feel that with the law standing as it does, with an embargo in effect as to the finished product of the high explosive or machine of death, the sending, as we are now doing, of the unassembled making, into war zones, to both nations, whether we consider ourselves neutral or not, no matter which nation finds us sending to the other nation that which it regards as contraband, as has been done with one vessel, has a tendency to get us involved in the war?

Mr. HENDRICKS. I will say to the gentleman that I thought of the incident that he mentioned, that today an American vessel is interned over in Russia. This might not have happened. I may also say that a great many Senators have expressed the same opinion that you have, that it would be less dangerous if we repealed the embargo.

Mr. PATRICK. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GIFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENDRICKS. I yield.

Mr. GIFFORD. I congratulate the gentleman because his attitude is exactly like my own. I reserve the right, until the Senate bill is produced, before I reach my ultimate conclusion. I congratulate the gentleman.

Mr. HENDRICKS. The gentleman probably reserves that right because of another reason. He wants to see what is in it. My point is that I am still young and I still have much to learn and I want to listen to what is said on the floor by distinguished men of the gentleman's type.

Mr. GIFFORD. I will state my own position tomorrow, but I want to ask the gentleman what does he think of this: All profess to favor the democracies. Our hopes, our fears are all in vain. They all say that. Then many proceed to show their inconsistencies and call attention to the ancient wrongs that they have perpetrated; but after professing that, can we say, "To hell with you"?

Mr. HENDRICKS. I certainly do not think so.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENDRICKS. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. How can we be true representatives of our constituents and express here on this floor any sympathy for any of the belligerents?

Mr. HENDRICKS. I think the answer to that would be evident. Our constituents have their sympathies. I think 90 percent of my constituents have their sympathies—not that they want to get into war, but if you ask them who they want to win they will tell you very quickly.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Just one other question.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Suppose our forefathers had taken that position when Genet came to this country, when there was considerable sympathy among our people for France. Suppose the men at the head of our Government had openly joined in that sympathy, where might we be today?

Mr. HENDRICKS. Well, I do not know. You are working on a supposition.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Will you allow me to make an observation?

Mr. HENDRICKS. If you will do so briefly, because I want to yield to some of these other gentlemen.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I do not believe any Congressman, Senator, or other public official has any right whatsoever to in any manner take sides in the present European conflict. The best interests of our country demand this.

Mr. HENDRICKS. The gentleman is free to do as he pleases, but I am going to express myself if someone asks me.

Mr. THORKELOSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENDRICKS. I yield.

Mr. THORKELOSON. What proportion of the American people do you believe are willing to send their boys across the Atlantic to fight this war in Europe today?

Mr. HENDRICKS. I think the proportion would be negligible. I do not think 1 percent of the people want to send our boys across the water at this time.

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENDRICKS. I yield.

Mr. GEYER of California. Practically all the experts have said that it is impossible to write a strictly neutral law, largely due to the geographical situation. Does not the gentleman believe that since the human mind that really thinks is not neutral, that we must have a law that is unneutral and that it ought to be unneutral in favor of those with whom the majority of our people are sympathetic?

Mr. HENDRICKS. Will not the gentleman make that as an observation rather than a question?

Mr. GEYER of California. Yes; I will.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENDRICKS. I yield.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Let me say in advance of my question that the gentleman has made a very valuable contribution to the debate on the question of neutrality. Knowing the gentleman as I do, I feel confident, regardless of his sympathies for any nation involved in this war, he will never vote for a bill that in his judgment will not preserve the peace of this country. Is that not correct?

Mr. HENDRICKS. I thank the gentleman for his observation. Let me say this to make my position clear: I detest war and am afraid of it. I am afraid of a gun. Not only do I hate war, but I am scared of war, and I say this, that I am going to do my dead level best as the Representative of my people in Congress to keep this Nation out of war, so far as sending soldiers over there is concerned. Being very much afraid of war personally, I shall never vote to force our boys to do something I would not do. If I am ever compelled to vote for war, I shall offer my own services to my Government. [Applause.]

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENDRICKS. I yield.

Mr. MOTT. The gentleman predicated a portion of his argument, as I understood, on the assumption that Hitler would win the war. Am I mistaken?

Mr. HENDRICKS. No; the gentleman is not mistaken. I said "suppose."

Mr. MOTT. Does the gentleman know of any military or naval authority in the United States which holds the opinion at this time that Hitler will win the present war?

Mr. HENDRICKS. I do not believe so.

Mr. MOTT. Then the presumption taken by the gentleman that Hitler would win the war is basing an argument upon a rather violent one, is it not?

Mr. HENDRICKS. No; it is not. In the first place, I made no assumption. I made a supposition. The reason I did it was merely to provoke thought. It is not yet impossible that he could win the war.

Mr. MOTT. But I say the gentleman knows of no military authority who believes so.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Even though the gentleman requires military authority, I still have the right to my own opinion on these things, even though I am no expert.

Mr. MOTT. I do not doubt that. I was merely trying to evaluate the gentleman's assumption.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENDRICKS. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Will the gentleman give us some reason for his statement that 90 percent of the American people want the Allies to win the war?

Mr. HENDRICKS. Yes; it was because of polls that have been taken—the Gallup poll, for instance—and more particularly because of the communications I have received from the citizens of America.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Because they favored the so-called democracies?

Mr. HENDRICKS. They have the right to favor whom they will. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the special order of the House heretofore made, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McDOWELL] is recognized for 20 minutes.

EMERGENCY POWERS OF THE PRESIDENT

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday last I introduced in this House, House Resolution 316, which will provide, if agreed to, an activity that is desired by 99 percent of the American public. The resolution in one sentence would authorize this House, through a committee, to examine the statutes of the United States and once and forever determine the authorized powers of the Presidency during a state of emergency such as the Nation is now in by Presidential proclamation.

The history of the writing of the resolution is this: Just prior to the beginning of this extraordinary session of the Congress various European nations declared formal war, whereupon the President of the United States, by proclamation, declared that a state of emergency exists, and all Members of the House know that the President, by virtue of this proclamation, is now in possession of authority not authorized him under normal peacetime conditions.

The circumstance brought about an almost instantaneous reaction in every State and city, hamlet, and farm in America. Just what are the powers of the President? At the beginning of the debate on the so-called neutrality bill in the other body the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] submitted a resolution, which was agreed to by the Senate, requesting the Attorney General of the United States to report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date what Executive powers are made available to the President under his proclamation of national emergency and what other extraordinary powers, if any, are made available to the Executive under existing statutes in emergency or state of war.

This resolution was agreed to September 28, and on October 5 the Attorney General, in a letter to the Senate, declined in effect to state these powers. The Attorney General accompanied his letter with various precedents substantiating his declination, but also listing a partial list of emergency powers granted the President. General Murphy, in his letter to the Senate, pointed out that he was declining to render a full report, and that he stood on more than 100 years of precedent in so doing, but the milk in the coconut was this statement, included in General Murphy's letter—I quote:

It is not claimed that this letter is complete—indeed, accuracy in this respect can be assured only by careful and painstaking search of the entire body of the Federal statutory law, statutes of this class having been enacted from time to time since the beginning of the Government.

General Murphy also stated:

You are aware, of course, that the Executive has powers not only from statutory grants but from the Constitution.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that action on the part of the Attorney General, as we well know, was vastly unpopular with the American people who want to know just what the Presidential powers are. That dissatisfaction was evident in the press all over the Nation. Many editorial writers, who are outstanding admirers of the administration, expressed their resentment that the American people would not be told what emergency powers are held in the White House.

After discussing the situation with numerous of my colleagues in both this House and in the Senate, I introduced House Resolution 316, pointing out the Senate's failure to obtain vital information that may have a great bearing on their action on the neutrality law, and authorizing the House of Representatives to create a committee of seven members, charged with the duty of studying the various United States statutes, and to present to the House at the earliest practicable date what Executive powers are made available under the said proclamation of national emergency.

The resolution includes an appropriation of \$10,000 to be used to employ legal counsel, and stenographic, and clerical hire.

Now in discussing this resolution with many Members of this House, I have talked to no one who did not agree that the House itself should have the information in order to intelligently consider the pending neutrality legislation. I have discussed the measure with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, with various Members of the Senate, with members of the press, and ordinary citizens of all political faiths, and they all agree that this action is many many years overdue, and that as a matter of good government the powers of the President should be learned without further delay.

This resolution is in no sense a hostile act against the administration. It is not desired to embarrass the President, nor to hinder his efforts to maintain strict neutrality for the people of America, and I fervently hope that it will not become partisan. It is purely an effort to obtain what every Member of the House and the Senate has been wanting to know for a long time, just exactly where we stand.

Everybody agrees that in every period of danger the Nation has ever undergone, that various unusual powers have been given the Chief Executive, and everybody knows that Congress is lax—very lax—in repealing emergency statutes. We have the word of the Attorney General that the only way to discover these powers is to examine the statutes enacted from time to time since the beginning of the Government.

Students of all law all agree that Presidents Madison, Polk, Buchanan, Lincoln, McKinley, Wilson, and Mr. Roosevelt have received extraordinary authorizations in extraordinary times. This resolution intends in no way to repeal any statute, but in effect, lays all the cards on the table that we may see just exactly what should be done and how we should do it.

Without impugning the motives of either the President or the Attorney General in declining to define all of the emergency powers of the White House, let me tell you that the refusal caused grave suspicion that both the Congress and the 120,000,000 American people which it represents should not be entrusted with the knowledge that should be their very own.

Mr. Speaker, I am aware, as is every other Member of the House, that no other legislation is to be considered except the child that is to be laid at our door by the other body. I think every Member of the House, whether they will publicly agree with me or not, believes that course to be a mistake, that there are many things to do, and that our idleness here is tragic when the country is suffering from so many ills.

The resolution was sent to the Rules Committee on October 18, where it now rests in a dark and crowded pigeonhole. This is, of course, because it was agreed that no other business would be considered here except the neutrality bill.

I maintain that most certainly the knowledge of the powers of the President are vital to intelligent consideration of legislation affecting our future in peace or war. The refusal of the Attorney General to give the Congress the information requested again illustrates the high necessity of legal counsel at the disposal of the Congress itself.

An effort has been made by many private individuals and concerns, particularly various newspapers in the Nation, to catalog these powers. I have several on my desk. Each contains references or authority of bygone years that the others do not have. It is a matter of good business to bring this information up to date. It will be as useful by the time the next World War gets started as it is in this one. The longer the Nation leaves this important matter unattended the more expensive and difficult it will be when it is finally done, and that is, of course, inevitable.

Here is a matter that does not involve politics. Here is a matter that requires a comparatively modest sum of money. Here is a matter that is being discussed wherever Americans meet all over the Nation. It is ridiculous that the Congress of the United States must learn what should be official public

knowledge from the public press or from patriotic attorneys who make a private investigation.

The concentration of power in the hands of single individuals of other nations has resulted in a holocaust that is now bathing Europe in blood. I would be just as concerned to learn the full powers of the President during an emergency if the President were Mr. Hoover, or Mr. Coolidge, or Teddy Roosevelt, or any other member of my own party.

Every Member of the Congress has received a copy of this resolution. Every response that has been made to me has been either favorable or noncommittal, but not once in the last 20 days that this has been discussed has there been one word of opposition or any suggestion that it be deferred until some other time.

Mr. Speaker, through all of the century and a half of the history of the House there has been one cardinal principle, and that is the complete independence of the body in the matter of gaining information that would aid the House in its decisions. I respectfully call this resolution to the attention of the Speaker, the majority leader, the chairman of the Rules Committee, and the members of that committee that they may be aware of the fact that in this hour of emergency the Nation is demanding information to which it is fully entitled and to which no Member of the House nor no official of the Congress can deny their right. I sincerely hope every Member of this body will subscribe to the constitutional right of information that is historic in the House of Representatives. [Applause.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Friday next, after the disposition of the other special orders that have been entered for that day, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] may address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, October 25, 1939, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1106. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report of the Archivist of the United States on a list of papers, consisting of one item, from those recommended to him for disposition, September 21, 1939, by the Department of the Navy; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

1107. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report of the Archivist of the United States on lists of papers, consisting of 16 items, from those recommended to him for disposition, August 24, 1939, by the Works Progress Administration; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

1108. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report of the Archivist of the United States on lists of papers, consisting of five items, from those recommended to him for disposition, October 7, 1935, by the Department of the Treasury; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GIFFORD:

H. R. 7596. A bill to provide for the reimbursement of certain members or former members of the United States Coast Guard (formerly the Bureau of Lighthouses) for the

value of personal effects lost in the hurricane of September 21, 1938, at several light stations on the coast of Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, and New York; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. POLK:

H. R. 7597. A bill granting a pension to Alice Catell McCoy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 7598. A bill granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Woods; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

5823. By Mr. GILLIE: Petition of 800 members and friends of St. Patrick's Catholic Church, Fort Wayne, Ind., urging Congress not to repeal the arms embargo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5824. By Mr. RUTHERFORD: Petition of sundry residents of Wayne County, Pa., protesting against the repeal of the arms embargo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 25, 1939

(Legislative day of Wednesday, October 4, 1939)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Z. Barney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and most merciful Father, who dost ever seek to draw us closer to Thyself with cords of love: Help us at this moment to lift our thoughts above life's sordid cares as we invoke Thy blessing, and may the spirit of Thy calm prevail as each, from his own experience, shall bring insight, sympathy, and help for others' need to the deliberations of this day. Grant, we beseech Thee, unto the men of our Nation that they may learn how sublime a thing it is to suffer and be strong for others, and may there be manifest a steady progress from less to more, from generous aspiration to serene and resolute manhood, so that of the citizens of our country it may well be said that their path is as a shining light that shineth more and more unto the perfect day. We ask it in our dear Redeemer's name and for His sake. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Tuesday, October 24, 1939, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Davis	King	Russell
Andrews	Donahay	La Follette	Schwartz
Austin	Downey	Lee	Schwellenbach
Bailey	Ellender	Lodge	Sheppard
Bankhead	Frazier	Lucas	Shipstead
Barbour	George	Lundeen	Slattery
Barkley	Gerry	McCarran	Smathers
Bilbo	Gibson	McKellar	Smith
Borah	Gillette	McNary	Stewart
Bridges	Green	Maloney	Taft
Brown	Guffey	Mead	Thomas, Okla.
Bulow	Gurney	Miller	Thomas, Utah
Burke	Hale	Minton	Tobey
Byrd	Harrison	Murray	Townsend
Byrnes	Hatch	Neely	Truman
Capper	Hayden	Norris	Tydings
Caraway	Herring	Nye	Vandenberg
Chandler	Hill	O'Mahoney	Van Nuys
Chavez	Holman	Overton	Wagner
Clark, Idaho	Holt	Pepper	Walsh
Clark, Mo.	Hughes	Pittman	White
Connally	Johnson, Calif.	Radcliffe	Wiley
Danaher	Johnson, Colo.	Reynolds	